DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 711		CS 212 175

AUTHOR	Kamberelis, George
TITLE	Emergent and Polyphonic Character of Voice in Adolescent Writing.
PUB DATE	Dec 86
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (36th, Austin, TX, December 3-6, 1986). This paper has been presented at other conferences, both in this version and in a longer version. The eight-page appendix is of poor legibility.
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Cultural Context; *Discourse Analysis; Expository Writing; High Schools; *Models; Reading Writing Relationship; *Social Influences; Writing (Composition); Writing Improvement; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Bakhtin (Mikhail); *Voice (Rhetoric); Writing Contexts; *Writing Style

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the emergent and polyphonic character of voice in adolescent writing. It proposes a model, derived from M. M. Bakhtin's work on discourse, to account for how adolescent writers borrow voices from various speech communities and communication domains and combine them in complex overt and covert ways in order to construct their own voices. The first section of the paper discusses the conceptions of language-in-use, voice, and semiotic mechanisms which allow for the borrowing and integrating of various voices; the second section illustrates the model with the analysis of two representative texts written by adolescents. The final section presents implications of this approach for the analysis of the writing of adolescents. Forty-four references and an appendix containing five student writing samples are attached. (KEH)

The Emergent and Polyphonic Character of Voice in Adolescent Writing

George Kamberelis
University of Michigan

A paper presented at the 36th annual National Reading Conference[1]
Austin, Texas
December, 1986

All correspondence may be sent to: George Kamberelis, Combined Program in Education and Psychology, 1400 School of Education Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259 (Telephone: 313-936-2946 or 313-668-1019)

[1]This paper was first presented at The Semiotics Institute of Northwestern University. (Summer, 1986). A shortened version of the paper was presented at the 36th annual National Reading Conference. Austin, Texas (December, 1986), at the Reading and Learning Skills Center of the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, Michigan (January, 1987), and in a Language and Literacy seminar at the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, Michigan (December, 1987). A longer and more theoretical version of the paper was presented at a special seminar on social cognition at the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, Michigan (May, 1987).

In this paper I explore the emergent and polyphonic character of voice in adolescent writing.[2] In particular, I propose a model to account, in a preliminary way, for how adolescent writers borrow voices from various speech communities and communication domains and combine them in complex overt and covert ways in order to construct their own voices. The article is composed of three sections. In the first section, which is theoretical, I discuss the conceptions of language-in-use, voice, and semiotic mechanisms which allow for the borrowing and integrating of various voices. In the second section I illustrate the model with the analysis of two representative adolescent texts. In the final section I present some implications of this approach for the analysis of adolescent writing.

The central concept in this study is voice. From my point of view, voice is a complex phenomenon. It includes the sense of voice as style informed by purpose that is prevalent in the literature on children's writing (Britton, 1970; Graves, 1983). It also includes the more sociolinguistic sense of voice constituted from language codes (Bernstein, 1971) and registers (Halliday, 1975). Finally, it includes the sense from literary analysis that voice is the style, world view, and ethos of a writer or a group of writers. While my conception of voice comes closest to this last sense, none of these discussions has explored the emergent and polyphonic nature of voice nor have they described the ways in which writers borrow and recombine voices to construct new voices.

My model of voice is derived from M. M. Bakhtin's (1981, 1984) work on discourse in the novel. In this work, he analyzes the mutual influences of the voices of individual characters and communities upon one another during their development in the novel. The novelist's voice is not viewed as being unitary, except in its control and exploration of the voices that are borrowed and allowed or encouraged to intermingle in the novel. Thus Bakhtin addresses explicitly both the emergent and polyphonic character of voice and the mechanisms of voice borrowing and recombining.

Bakhtin and Soviet sociolinguistics

[2] My interest in voice grows from a larger project in which I am trying to draw together and integrate notions from the following areas: (1) adolescent developmental psychology which suggests that the critical psychological tasks of adolescents have to do with identity, power, and belonging (Erikson, 1968; Offer, Ostrov, & Howard, 1981); (2) post-structuralist and psychoanalytic concepts of the self as an historically and socially constituted unfinalizable process (Foucault, 1970; Lacan, 1977); and (3) sociolinguistics and communication studies which emphasize the role of language in the constitution of personalities and communities.

Bakhtin's notion of voice is based in the cultural-historical-linguistic context of Soviet sociolinguistics during the early part of this century. Bakhtin (1984) refers to his enterprise as "translinguistics" or "metalinguistics." His sense of metalinguistics is quite different from the traditional sense of language about language.

> We have in mind discourse, that is, language in its concrete living totality, and not language as the specific object of linguistics, something arrived at through a completely legitimate and necessary abstraction from various aspects of the concrete life of the word. But precisely those aspects in the life of the word that linguistics makes abstract are, for our purposes, of primary importance. Therefore the analyses that follow are not linguistic in the strict sense of the terms. They belong rather to metalinguistics, if we understand by that term the study of those aspects in the life of the word, not yet shaped into separate and specific disciplines, that exceed--and completely legitimately--the boundaries of linguistics. (p. 181)

For Bakhtin there is no such thing as autonomous discourse because the elements, once used, are historically and socially situated. Moreover, all elements such as words, turns of phrase, and voices are continually changing. Bakhtin's sense of language as mutable, reversible, contaminable, anti-hierarchical and regenerative is illustrated in the following quotation. (The Russian term slovo, which has been translated as "word" in this passage, is a very rich term which might also have been translated as utterance, speech pattern, or even discourse.)

> When each member of a collective of speakers takes possession of a word, it is not a neutral word of language free from the aspirations and valuations of others, uninhabited of foreign voices. No, he receives the word from the voice of another, and the word is filled with that voice. The word arrives in his context from another context which is saturated with other people's interpretations. His own thought finds the word already inhabited. Therefore, the orientation of the word among words, the various perceptions of the other person's words and the various means of reacting to it are, perhaps, the most essential problems for the metalinguistic study of every kind of word including the artistic. [Volosinov (assumed to be one of Bakhtin's pseudonyms), 1973, p. 167]

Voice Borrowing and Recombining

Bakhtin's ideas about language borrowing and polyphonic voice fall quite naturally out of his metalinguistics with its emphasis on the concrete, social, historical utterance. Bakhtin's use of the term voice is quite different from its use in much current literature on the writing process (cf. Britton, 1970; Graves, 1983; see also Cox & Tinzmann, 1986, for a discussion of the development of the literate voice) which equates voice with writing purposes or categories. In Britton's (1970) scheme, for example, three types of voice are put forward: expressive, transactional, and poetic. The expressive voice is language which is close to the self, used to reveal the nature, thoughts, and feelings of the writer and to show the writer's close relation to the reader. The transactional voice is language that aims at getting something done: relaying information, giving instructions, persuading others, or forming an argument. The poetic voice

is language used in order to create a verbal object, a verbal work of art.

In this literature, voice is viewed as a clear unitary style of the writer in which the intermingling of other voices is forbidden unless explicitly quoted or signalled. From this point of view, adolescent writers appear particularly clumsy in their control of voice. From Bakhtin's view, the struggles of the adolescent writer are a natural part of the task of the writer and voice is not expected to be unitary. In fact, even in the height of novelistic art, which is the polyphonic novel, the "unitary" voice can only be conceived as the integrated intermingling of the many voices; the voices both speak for themselves and "interanimate" one another.

Voice is, thus, a sociolinguistic phenomenon and represents both the verbal-ideological perspective of an individual and a speech community. It serves to identify any word or any utterance as derived from a given individual or speech community. For example, the "cant" of the legal profession is unmistakable and represents the verbal-ideological perspective of that community. However, when a speaker or writer appropriates this "cant", it becomes double-voiced, reflecting both its historical sense and the intentions of the current speaker or writer. The novice (or adolescent) may do this more clumsily than the expert, but both are wrestling with the polyphonic nature of voice.

"A voice always has a will or a desire behind it, its own timbre and overtones" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 434). It is always constructed in a particular historical and social context, rather than from the individuality and raw creativity of the author. It is almost always emergent--coming to be--and polyphonic--composed of many voices which may interact in many different ways. In this article, I examine how adolescents borrow and recombine different discourses embodying different voices from many sources to construct their discourses embodying their own polyphonic voices.

Although some work has been done on the importance of imitation and originality in adolescent writing (Phelps & Mano, 1986), little attention has been given to the nature of how the appropriation of other people's language is transformed during the development of a writer. Bakhtin's (1981) view is that, in the use of language, a speaker or writer is constantly "struggling with another's discourse," or answering the historical-ideological context. Answering and authoring are closely related activities. The accusation that adolescent writing is "imitative" may thus be a misunderstanding of the "answering" nature of discourse.

Bakhtin proposes a typology of voice borrowing that may help us understand both the adolescent's wrestling with self-identity and with the young writer's potential to use a given utterance in an artfully double-voiced way--simultaneously to reflect its own history and to reflect the writer's intention in his/her own creation.

[3]Typology of Voice Borrowing

3

When considering Bakhtin's claims about the intermingling, or interanimation, of voices, it is important to recognize that he was not concerned simply with ways in which one utterance can refer to another. Furthermore, he was not focusing on how a speech utterance can enter into an iconic relationship with other utterances or with non-linguistic cultural action. Rather, he was concerned with the ways in which one utterance indexes another, because that other is intricated in it. The complex nature of this indexical relationship is reflected in Kristeva's (1980) discussion of Bakhtin's ambivalent word. The term "ambivalent" implies the insertion both of history and society into an utterance and of this utterance into history and society. For the speaker/writer, these are integral.

According to Kristeva's (1980) interpretation of Bakhtin, the speaker or writer:

> ... can use another's word giving it new meaning while retaining the meaning it already had. The results is a word with two significations: it becomes ambivalent. The word is therefore the result of the joining of two sign systems.... The forming of two sign systems relativizes the text (or utterance). (p. 73)

Several kinds of ambivalent words (or words embodying polyphonic voices) are set forth and discussed by Bakhtin. These ambivalent words, as Kristeva has noted, are the products of borrowing another's words marked by another's voice and superimposing on them some new or different meaning(s). The kinds of voice borrowing which result in the double-voiced or ambivalent words which I will discuss include imitation; stylization; narration, quotation and paraphrase; and hidden or overt polemic. All of these represent the "use of someone else's discourse for one's own purposes by inserting a new semantic intention into a discourse which already has, and which retains, an intention of its own" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 189).

Imitation.

Imitation is the unselfconscious use of someone else's words, syntax, discourse style, etc. The imitator takes the imitated material seriously; s/he makes it his or her own by directly appropriating someone else's discourse.[4]

Stylization.

Unlike imitation which blurs, even abolishes, the distance between self and other, stylization maintains an objective stance towards the other's discourse by rendering it conditional. The speaker or writer uses the sum total of devices associated with another's speaking or writing to express the same point of view or create the same effect. The other is the condition for the particular point of view expressed or effect achieved. The other, however, is not responsible for

[4]The distinction between imitation and plagiarism is evidently one of self-conscious versus unselfconscious intention to appropriate another's words. Additionally it has to do with how much of a text is borrowed or what aspects of a text are borrowed: exact content versus style, voice, ideas.

the entire meaning, effect, or results of the new discourse. That is the work of the speaker or writer who stylizes another's discourse.

The boundary between imitation and stylization is a fuzzy one. Indeed, it is often difficult to distinguish between them when attempting to code texts in terms of patterns of voice borrowing and use. Often neither a complete merging of voices (imitation) nor an explicit indexing of another's voice (stylization) is accomplished by a writer. Rather, some intermediate form is produced.

Narration, quotation, and paraphrase.

These are straightforward, legitimate forms of borrowing of other people's discourses. The speaker or writer directly or quasi-directly appropriates someone else's verbal-ideological content and style as a position or point of view which s/he considers indispensible to carry out his/her discourse intentions. With narration, quotation, and paraphrase, the dependence of one's discourse on that of another is more explicit than with stylization. For example, a narrator marks the discourse of others with explicit dialogue markers like John said , "......." or with other more or less explicit cues.

Parody.

Another kind of ambivalent discourse or form of voice borrowing is the parody of someone else's discourse. Here, the speaker or writer infuses the discourse with a signification opposed to that of the other's discourse, thus parodying it. Bakthin's description of parodistic discourse is especially succinct and clear:

> The second voice, once having made its home in the other's discourse, clashes hostilely with its primordial host and forces him to serve directly opposing aims. Discourse becomes an arena of battle between two voices. (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 193)

Hidden or overt polemic.

Thus far I have discussed what Bakhtin regards to be "passive" ambivalent words in the sense that the verbal-ideological perspectives which are borrowed remain meek and passive. He also posits several kinds of "active" ambivalent words including the natural "dialogue" and the "hidden or overt polemic." With both "the other's words actively influence the author's speech, forcing it to alter itself accordingly under their influence and initiative" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 197). The influence of another's discourse without its direct appropriation is especially apparent in the hidden polemic wherein:

> . . . [T]he author's discourse is directed toward its own referential object, as is any other discourse, but at the same time every statement about the object is constructed in such a way that, apart from its referential meaning, a polemical blow is struck at the

> other's discourse on the same theme, at the other's statement about the same object. (p. 197)

There are many ways in which another's speech is indexed in the speech of a given speaker or writer. Thus, in order to interpret an utterance, a context including other verbal-ideological perspectives or voices must be taken into account. As I have mentioned, the context at issue here is not necessarily the one created by the utterances immediately surrounding the utterance under consideration. The context is often hidden somewhere in the verbal-ideological history of the speaker and needs to be excavated or deconstructed. This exophoric context has largely been ignored in most analyses of child and adolescent writing where the focus has primarily been upon the use of endophoric reference in the interest of text cohesion (cf. Halliday & Hasan, 1976). I believe that the verbal-ideological history of the child or adolescent writer is important and often critical in understanding and analyzing his/her texts, particularly in the understanding of voice.

Application of the Model

I have a large collection of student writing from my days as a student and teacher. Two data sets from this collection are particularly interesting. The first is a group of essays written by inner city high school students taking part in a voluntary composition course offered through a summer park district program in Chicago. I was an instructor in the course. The writing tasks included a description and commentary upon an important personal experience; a compare and contrast paper; a "how to" paper; a piece of literacy criticism; and a persuasive argument.

The second and smaller set derives from a college creative writing class of which a friend of mine participated. Stories produced in this class were shared among members. There were 10 in all.

I have analyzed many of the samples from these two sources in a preliminary way for the presence of borrowed language and the intermingling of voices using the theoretical model and typology of voices presented above. In particular, I have coded relevant sections of the texts in terms of the main types of reported discourse worked out by Bakhtin: imitation; stylization; narration, quotation, or paraphrasing; parody; and hidden or overt polemic. For this paper, I will present and discuss two representative samples.

Analysis.

For the purposes of this paper but more for my own continued work on the topic of emergent and polyphonic voice in adolescent writing, I have tried to determine whether or not the typology of voice borrowing derived from Bakhtin can be applied in a systematic way to adolescent written texts. I have trained a work study student to code texts using the above mentioned typology. At this point our agreement is by consensus and not independent. While we had difficulty in discriminating between certain categories (imitation and stylization; parody and

polemic), we were able to come to a satisfactory level of agreement. This agreement was also based upon some knowledge of the general context of the lives of the students. In the examples which follow (see Appendix), sections which we judged to be voice borrowing are underlined and coded.

The examples.

The first text was written by a black inner-city athlete named Darrell. It is indeed personal and heartfelt. It is also clearly addressed to an audience who will share his point of view and will admire and respect him for expressing his view: his parents, his minister, his parish, his teachers, and us--the people who gave him the assignment and will evaluate it.

Darrell's essay is filled with voice borrowings, especially discourse representations of three types: imitation, stylization, and narration/
quotation/paraphrase. In many instances, it is difficult to determine exactly how he uses and thus represents other people's discourse in his own writing. It is especially difficulty to distinguish betwen imitation and stylization. This seems due largely to two sources: (1) the boundary between these two modes of borrowing is fuzzy and there are not always clear linguistic markers to distinguish them; and (2) these two different modes of borrowing represent the writer's emotional/evaluative relation to or investment in the language he uses and thus refer back to the individuals and speech communities from which the language was borrowed. Thus, when subtle discriminations are required, context clues from the writer's personal history become useful and sometimes critical for coding and understanding the meaning of student texts. Part of the reason for this has to do with the fact that all texts--those of professionals as well as students--are situated in particular personal histories and in a particular cultural, historical time. Another part of the reason has to do with the fact that the literate (literary) skills of style and voice as well as metacognitive awareness of these skills is just emerging during adolescence. Just as young emergent writers experiment with spellings and borrow print from the environment (see Sulzby & Teale, 1985), so do more mature writers experiment with, borrow, and combine various styles and voices.

Most of the imitated and/or stylized language in Darrell's essay seems to come from ministerial discourse (4, 7, 10, 11, 13, perhaps 15, 18, 19, 10) and the discourse of adults who are important role models for him (5, 6, perhaps 15). Instances of ministerial discourse include: (4) "God has truly blessed me." (10) "Did God not love this people?" (11) "What did they do to have this curtain of darkness upon them." and (18) "People should take heed in their morals." Darrell is quite religious and has great respect for his minister. Therefore, I tend to believe that these borrowings are imitative rather than stylized. Darrell not only uses them, but he also makes them his own, incorporates them into his own voice and discourse style. To be completely confident

with this coding decision, I believe that more contextual information is required. In other words, I would have to know the writer better.

The source of Darrell's sentence (15), "This I feel is a sin," is puzzling. It appears likely that it could be discourse common either to the speech community of the church or the family or both. I believe that because of the absence of explicit ministerial discourse markers except for the word "sin" and because of the softening of the statement with the verb "feel" that this sentence embodies the voice of the family. However, a more definitive coding of this sentence requires more contextual knowledge.

Nevertheless, Darrell's use of both ministerial and family discourse for his own writing suggests the importance of these people in his life--as role models and as audience. His use of language renders clues about his psychosocial development. Conversely, an understanding of his psychosocial development yields important clues about his development as a writer and especially about the emergent and polyphonic character of voice in his writing.

Two instances of voice borrowing in Darrell's essay seem to be clumsy attempts at narration or stylizations of essay or commentary writing. These are (2) "told of" and (3) "in search of food." Both of these phrases are somewhat awkward in the sentential context in which they are used. Darrell appears to be experimenting with the role of narrator or essayist in his use of these terms. The effect of his attempts at these roles is not unlike the effect of a young child donning her mother's too large clothes and shoes. They don't quite fit. Unlike the instances of imitation discussed above, these instances of stylization and/or narration have not been well-integrated into Darrell's polyphonic voice and writing styel. He has not yet made them his own nor has he gained mastery over a more objective use of them.

One obvious and quite humorous instance of parody or hidden polemic appears in Darrell's essay when he writes: (16) "To make things worse, the president has cancer. The U.S. becomes very concerned." The statement that the president has cancer presumably derives from a news report since this diagnosis and the Live Aid concert were co-occurring. The statement was a simple news fact. Darrell's use of the statement, however, is parodic and/or polemical. Either he simply parodies the statement because of its triviality compared to world hunger or he launches a polemic against regarding immediate events, concerns, and values more highly than more important but less immediate humanistic and moral concerns. I would argue that Darrell's use of this statement is more of a hidden polemic than a parody, recognizing that a definitive determination is impossible given the data at hand. I would argue this way because Darrell uses other people's discourse less in this instance than he directs his discourse at a common referent in an attempt to subvert its original meaning.

Several examples of narration, quotation, or paraphrase occur in Darrell's text. The first is his verbatim use of the directions for the writing assignment, (1) "learned something remarkable." Most of the other instances seem to come from the Live Aid concert and news commentary on it even though Darrell does not explicitly mark them as such. Examples include: (8) "Their land is so dry and hard," (9) "To live there must be a great ordeal," and (17) "when millions die every year, thousands a day. . . ." One of the reasons that these statements are not referenced is Darrell's inexperience as a writer. Another is the fact that he has begun to make these ideas and the voices in which they are embodied his own. As paraphrases or narratives, they are highly subjectivized and approach stylized or imitative borrowings.

The second text in the appendix was written by an aspiring poet and short story writer, named Joseph. It is quasi-autobiographical. What I analyze and discuss constitutes the first several pages of a forty page short story. Two important sociolinguistic dramas are played out in this section of the text. First is Joseph's relationship to literature and its history and criticism. Second is the relationships of power and solidarity between and among the friends in the story.

While Joseph is quite an accomplished and talented writer, sections of the text are highly stylized. It is as if he is experimenting with different authorial voices in different sections of his story. At times his stryle is literary in a kind of generalized way as in : "The sunlight leaps in the bright wind. I love to be with them because they are masters of the art of wasting time. They make going out for breakfast or just walking down Chicago streets a piquant, relaxed pleasure." (p.3) At other times his voice seems both borrowed and his own, an intermediary owning, like in the following passage which distantly echoes the opening pages of Albert Camus' The Stranger of which he is fond:

> I stepped off the bus and looked at the wet bright yellow maple and oak leaves all over the sidewalk and in the gutter. It was eleven in the morning, Saturday, November tenth. Sunlight danced, the air was like winter, visible, the light changed gradually. I felt empty and hard, happy to feel the energy in people's faces.

And at other times he seems to borrow and make his own in very precise ways the styles of other writers. The following passage possesses imagery, rythmn, and timbre very much like that of Gary Snyder's work, particularly pieces like "Burning 14." Incidentally, Snyder is one of Joseph's favorite poets. This section of Joseph's story represents a kind of urbanized version of Snyder's poem. I will present short sections of both Joseph's story and Snyder's poem for comparison:

Joseph

Leaves for eyes. The empty streets, bright cars.
A black man stands, a white woman walks.
Fallen leaves by the cement wall.

<u>Snyder</u>

Knees, the cornered eyes,
tea on a primus stove after a cold swim,
intricate doors and clocks, the clothes
we stand in--

As good a writer as Joseph is, much of his work at this point in his life is stylized. He tries on literary styles as a child might try on her mother's too large shoes and dress. The effect is similar. Neither the acts nor the results are bad. They represent development in progress, the forging of identity and one's own style by experimenting with those of others. I am not arguing that Joseph's voice is not genuine. Indeed, it is painfully genuine as Joseph is painfully real. Yet his literary self (and his personality in general) are developing, and playing roles facilitates development.

Joseph's story also reveals that he has taken quite seriously the voices of his teachers and the literary critics he has read. His attempt to explain the nature nad function of poetry to Johnny (p.5) is testimony to this.

While there are many more instances of various types of represented or double voiced discourse in Joseph's story, I will note and comment upon just a few. Camilla's statements; "We're such fucking consumers." and "He's probably an asshole." are interesting stylizations of peer group discourse. Even more interesting is that the stylizations are at once almost parodies of themselves, and thus Camilla is almost a parody of herself. This suspicion is supported by her quasi-confessional comment that " it's supposed to be <u>our</u> music because we know about it." (p.1) Note, too, that Camilla's sentiments are probably images of Joseph's, for he is the writer of this text.

Joseph's story contains many hidden polemics. In the section I am analysing, Johnny provides several of them. Johnny's comment: "What are you bringing books to bed for?" (p.3) is clearly a hidden polemic. Johnny knows Joseph very well. He knows that Joseph loves books and is never without them. He knows that much of Joseph's self concept revolves around books. He also knows what bed means and about the undercurrents opf desire between Joseph and Camilla. In commenting on the legitimacy of bringing books to bed, then, Johnny strikes a disguised polemical blow against Joseph's sexuality. Interestingly, Joseph diffuses the polemic with one of his own: "I always bring books to bed." He states this as if Johnny is supposed to know it anyway and as if most people do.

Johnny attempts another hidden polemic when he utters: "You're a poet-- people must say that to you a lot." (p.4) If Joseph is really a poet and if poets are legitimate spokesmen, then Joseph ought to be able to explain to Johnny something about poetry which the latter will

understand. Joseph falls into Johnny's trap by answering him in "catch phrases and buzzwords. What is especially interesting about Johnny's utterance is the nature of its disguise as a polemic. The polemical blow is delivered quite gently in the text, but, of course, Joseph wrote the text. I would guess that Joseph consistently underplays the division between Johny and himself, and that a comparable polemic would be less gentle and disgused. On the other hand, Johnny does like Joseph. They are friends, and perhaps the tension between them seldom becomes explicit. Indeed, the entire text reveals that Johnny is neither defenseless, nor uneducated, nor unintelligent. He shifts positionings with respect to Joseph quite frequently, and it is often difficuly to assess his intentions.

The structural oppositions created in the dialogues between the polyphonic voices in this story are also very interesting. Indeed, the text is built around verbal-ideological oppositions which are at once not oppositions at all, but rather aspects of complex wholes: I/you, couple/single, genuine selves/actors, books/no books, nature culture, child/adult, productive/lazy, dialogue/poetic monolgue, real/verbal, poet/non-poet, ours/theirs, history/present. These dichotomies/ non-dichotomies characterize the social scene represented in the text and they are lived out by all of the characters in the story. In particular, the tension of these inchoate dichotomies is felt and lived out by Joseph. A paradox or struggle inhabits all of the polyphonic voices in the text which reveals the simultaneous presence of solidarity and division. mutual but contradictory feelings of having but not having, genuine care but poorly understood jealousy and envy. The point of view in the story shifts back and forth between the "we" of the group of friends and and the I/you which represents their different ideological and real-life positionings. This shifting point of view makes clear the tension between solidarity and division with which these friends are wrestling, especially Joseph and Johnny. Joseph has his books; Johnny has Camilla. Each would like to have what the other has, or perhaps each would like to have both. Neither, however, would be content to simply switch positionings. Camilla, too, would like to have both men, but both men in one. Note the imaginative interchange between Joseph and Camilla set up in the text by Joseph(p.4):
Joseph: "You're a force of nature." / Camilla (in Joseph's memory or imagination but instantiated later by her kiss: "Women won't play nature to your culture." Both utterance are strategic and polemical, sexually and politically challenging. Joseph's "culture" is part of the economy of pleasure used to seduce and dominate. He praises her "nature" with his "culture"--by making it poetic. Camilla acknowledges him and poses a challenge. Thus, her nature is its equal opposite. She affirms her own "nature" by playing it off against his "culture", but she does so on his terms--in cultural, literary voice. What could be more seductive? While this whole drama is verbally constructed by Joseph as he speaks in both voices, it appears to reflect a present non-verbal dynamic and an ongoing real-life dialogue.

For all of the friends in the story, to be in love yet independent, genuine yet foolish, natural yet cultural--all in delicate balance--seems to be the ideal against which they evaluate their developing selves and into which they position themselves in social situations, at least imaginatively. The interplay of the discordant voices of Joseph and Johhny as they talk about books (for Camilla's benefit) make this complicated web of binarism, personal and social tension, resistance, desire, and solidarity especially poignant.

The same kind of drama is played out by Joseph in his development as a writer. He incorporates the voices of many writers and speakers into his own emergent and polyphonic voice. His is developing identity as a person and as a writer parallel one another.

One other general social and political "voice" is utilized in this story which is worth noting. This is the use of epistemic modality. Modality is characteristically employed in social interchanges to assert or to abdicate a position of power and to deny or to invite an interlocutor to take control. It is also used to find out where on stands with respect to social relationships. Both Johnny and Joseph use epistemic modality in their speech, and their uses of it serve to mark the tensions described above. When Johnny says to Camilla: "He would love you," and "I don't think I'd like him," (p.1) he invites her to provide feedback on their relationship and her sensibilities. When Joseph says to Johnny: "I think you would love this book and understand it as fully as anyone," he shares his cultural power with Johnny in an apparent attempt to affirm the solidarity of their friendship. He invites Johnny into his culture by downplaying both the culture itself and his position in it. These modal statements, and others like them, represent critical moments in the negotiation of relationships of power-desire, power-knowledge, and power-solidarity. They have important consequences for developing selves and developing writers because they re-position individuals in these various relationships.

Discussion: Problems and Implications

If nothing else, I hope that I have convinced the reader to view written language through a sociologist's eyes. Writing is a socially constructed cultural form. It is social interaction in much the same way that speaking is social interaction. The interlocutor(s) are sometimes behind the writing, sometimes in the writing, and sometimes ahead of it--usually all three at once. Texts are constructed from other texts, often many of them, and they develop in relation to other texts. The same is true of the voices within texts. Indeed, these two aspects of langauge are not always separable.

The writing of adolescents is a particularly clear window through which to view the interanimation of voices in the attempt to forge a voice of one's own. Adolescents must struggle for identity, power, nd belonging in a number of different social settings--home, school, peer

group(s), church, community, and so forth. In the process of these struggles, all of which aim toward wholeness and singularity, many identifications, ways of being and talking, modes of belonging, and power relations are accepted, resisted, and rejected. These struggles, along with the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral alignments adopted by adolescents are reflected in their written texts. Indeed, they use writing to work out many of these struggles. It becomes for them a kind of serious play in which they can experiment with different selves and social positionings. Therefore, any written utterance usually registers many interminglig, interanimating, and even contradictory voices opr ideological perspectives. Treating adolescent written texts (and all written texts for that matter) as complex "intertextual" texts interanmated with many voices results in a better understanding of the texts themselves, the functions of writing employed by adolescents, and the psychological and interpersonal issues which motivate the employment of writing functions and the construction of written texts.

I have explored a model that would account for the emergence of voice in adolescent writing, a model based upon the theory of M. M. Bakhtin. One of the greatest problems I face in continuing work in this area has to do with terminology. The term voice is conceived in a variety of different ways by different theorists. It is applied in a variety of different ways as well. Similarly, more clear distinctions need to be made between voice and other terms, such as style, code, and register. Moreover, clear definitions are needed for many complex new terms becoming familiar in today's theoretical literature: polyphonic voice, intertextuality, and discourse representation. (In many respects these new terms refer to the same thing; however, there are subtle differences in their foci. For example, polyphonic voice focuses on the interleaving of semantic intentions while intertextuality focuses on texts as rejoinders to or extensions of other texts.)

I still need to resolve several problems with respect to the applications of our model thus far. First, I need to find ways to discern more systematically between instances of imitation and stylization; stylization and narration, quotation, or paraphrase; and parody and polemic. Since these distinctions depend so much on the author's investment in the language s/he borrows and uses, it appears to me that increased contextual knowledge is required (see Friedman & Sulzby, 1986). Retrospective interviews and think-aloud protocols might be useful in this regard. Second, I need to find a way to achieve consistency in coding and interpretation across independent raters. Here, too, more contextual knowledge is needed. It is important to know about the various speech communities to which a writer belongs, the people with whom s/he sharesimportant relationships, and the nature of his/her relationships with these communities and individuals.

While the analytic model I have used requires further refining, I believe that it is a productive and useful tool for understanding adolescent writing through an understanding of the

psychosocial develoment of the adolescent writer; and conversely, it is a useful and productive tool for understanding the psychosocial development of the adolescent writer through an understanding of the interanimating voices in her or her writing.

The mutual understanding of the psychosocial development of the writer and the interanimation of voices in his/her writing afforded by this model suggests important implications for teaching and evaluating adolescent writing. Our models heretofore have examined the form of the writing or functions of writing in terms of self to other speech acts; this model suggests a bidirectional relationship between self and other inherent in the composition act that can be accessed by the reader--including the teacher of the adolescent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Althusser, L. (1971). For Marx. London: Allen Lane/the Penguin Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). The dialogic imagination. Austin: University of Texas Press.

_______. (1984). Problems in Dostoevsky's poetics. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Bernstein, B. (1971). Class, codes and control: Theoretical studies toward a sociology of language. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bruner, J.S. (1975). The ontogenesis of speech acts. Journal of Child Language, 2, 1-17.

Derrida, J. (1973). Speech and phenomena. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Eco, U. (1979). The role of the reader. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Erikson, E.H. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: W.W. Norton.

Fishman, J. (1971). Sociolinguistics: A brief introduction. Rowley, MA: Newberg House.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archeology of knowledge. London: Allen Lane.

_______. (1982). The subject and power. Critical Inquiry, 8, 777-95.

_______. (1981). Questions of method: An interview with Michel Foucault. Ideology and Consciousness, 8, Spring.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books, Inc.,

Giles, H., & Powesland, P. (1975). Speech style and social evaluation. London: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Greenberg, JR. and Mitchell, S.A. (1983). Object relations in psychoanalytic theory. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). Learning how to mean. New York: Elsevier North Holland, Inc.

Hymes, D. (1972). Language in society. Language and Society, I, 1-14.

______. (1971). On communicative competence. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Inhelder, B., & Piaget, J. (1958). The growth of logical thinking: From childhood to adolescence. New York: Basil Books.

Jacobson, E. (1964). The self and the object world. New York: IUP.

Kristeva, J. (1980). Desire in language. New York: Columbia University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

______. (1963). The motivation of a sound change. Word, 19, 273-309.

Lacan, J. (1977). Ecrits: A selection. London: Tavistock.

Le Maire, A. (1977). Jacques Lacan. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Litowitz, B.E. (1985). The speaking subject in adolescence. In S. Feinstein, M. Sugar, A. Esman, J. Looney, A. Schwartzberg, & A. Sorosky (Eds.) Adolescent psychiatry, 12. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Litowitz, B.E., & Gundlach, R. (1985). When adolescents write. Paper presented at the annual fall seminar, The Irene Josselyn Clinic, Northfield, IL, November 13.

Lyons, J. (Ed.). (1970). New horizons in linguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1973). Consciousness and the acquisition of language. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

______. (1969). Signs. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Nelson, K. (1979). Explorations in the development of a functional child language system. In W. A. Collins (Ed.) Twelfth Minnesota symposium on child psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ricoeur, P. (1979). Freud and philosophy. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ryan, E.R., Giles, H., & Sebastian, R.J. (1982). An integrative perspective for the study of attitudes toward language variation. In E. Ryan & H. Giles (Eds.) Attitudes towards language variation. (pp. 208-233), London: Edward Arnold.

de Saussure, F. (1959). Course in gerneral linguistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Skinner, Q. (Ed.). (1985). The return of grand theory in the human sciences. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, P., Giles, H., & Hewestone, M. (1980). Sociolinguistics: A social psychological perspective. In R. St. Clair & H. Giles (Eds.). The social psychological contexts of language. (pp. 283-298), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tough, J. (1977). The development of meaning: A study of children's use of language. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Volosinov, V.N. (1976). Freudiamism: A Marxist critique. New York: Academic Press.

______. (1973). Marxism and the philosophy of language. New York: Seminar Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.) The concept of activity in Soviet psychology. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

______. (1978). Mind in Society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

______. (1976). Play and its role in the mental development of the child. In J.S. Bruner, A. Joley, & K. Silva (Eds.) Play: Its role in development and evolution. New York: Basic Books.

______. (1962). Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: M.I. T Press.

APPENDIX

Thoughts on Famine

1=SK
The time I learned something remarkable was when I found out millions die. They die from the lack of food. One day I was looking at T.V. and saw a
2=ST
program. This program told of many stories of families that were in search of
3=ST
food. It also told of the families that never found it. As I watched this program, it made me think. It made me think about how lucky I am. God has
4=ST
truly blessed me. I am lucky how I get almost all the things I want and food
5=ST 6=ST
is the least of my concerns. The thing that touched me the most were the eyes and bodies of these hungry people. I never saw so much pain in so many eyes.
7=ST
To kill is bad, but to let die is just as bad.

The bodies of these poor people look as if bones made them. Their land is
8=SK
so dry and the earth is very hard. To live there must be a great ordeal. I
9=ST/SK
have only God to thank for not letting me be there. On the program, they showed many young kids, most were babies. Flies were all around them, they landed on the people to give them a sicker look. To see these things almost
10=ST
brought me to tears. Then I wondered, did God not love this people. What did
11=ST
they do to have this curtain of darkness upon them.

In my life I have seen many bad things, but nothing can compare to hurt and pain these people must go through every day. They wake not knowing if
12=ST/SK
they will live the day out.

13=ST
To have and not give is wrong, but to give and not have is good. The U.S. has more than enough food. It has extra food in its surplus. The U.S. could give all of it and would never be short. 14=ST Our government has turned its back on the hungry. It is sad, so sad, that many go hungry in the U.S. 15=ST This I feel is a sin. The rich become more rich, and the poor becomes poorer. To make things 16=P/IP but stylized worse, the president has cancer. The U.S. becomes very concerned. But when millions die every 17=SK year, thousands a day, no one seems to care. The song "We are the World" says a lot. 18=ST People should take heed in their morals.

I know that Live Aid has raised a lot of money. This makes things a lot better for them. If it were not for the singers, the dying would go on. It would have lasted until all were dead. This proves to me that the 19=ST goodness of mankind is true. I have only prayers for the ones who have 20=ST died the worst death imagine to man. To those who live, I have hope, hope for the future.

The Green Language the Color of Fire

Light on the Window Cill

Everything was all right. Camilla felt the calm as soon as she opened her eyes. She saw the bright winter sunlight on the window cill and the sunlight on the ceiling. Last night at five Johnny was sobbing, kneeling on the rug trying to breathe out or scream out a sorrow twisting his face that he couldn't name and she couldn't feel. Now all pain was gone in the morning light.

When she came back from the bathroom she opened the door, smiled at him, and said emphatically, "We're such fucking consumers. Think about it. We take Rachel to Tuts to see James White and the Blacks so she thinks we're genuine bohemians; it's supposed to be our music because we know about it. But we don't know James White. We've never been invited to the same party as him. He's probably an asshole. I wouldn't even want to go backstage."

"I don't think I'd like him," Johnny said. Johnny was curled up on the futon with the down comforter pulled up to his chin. "It seems like he'd be exactly like his music, but he would love you."

"It's the way you look. He would 'love' any girl who could carry it off. I'm trying to say that we're not part of anything. We don't speak for ourselves. We're not with people who speak for themselves."

"There's a lot going on up here."

"Do you think any of our friends will get famous?"

"No. You will."

"Right, for lying on TV."

"It isn't just that we introduce Rachel to music she doesn't know about; it's the way we are."

I stepped off the bus and looked at the wet, bright yellow maple and oak leaves all over the sidewalk and in the gutter. It was eleven in the morning, Saturday, November tenth. Sunlight danced, the air was like winter, visible, the light changed gradually. I felt empty and hard, happy to feel the energy in people's faces, to be part of the day, to be a wanderer in the day. The courtyard of their apartment building was filled with bright yellows, browns, and reds. And the wet, dark earth. I opened the wood and glass door to the shadowy lobby and rang the buzzer.

Camilla opened the door for me.

"Joseph! Hi!"

"Hi, how are you doing?"

"We're in bed. Come get in bed with us."

I followed her down the hall into their bedroom. I saw the sunlight in the kitchen for a second. I sat on the bottom corner of the futon with my back to the wall. I took out a joint and lit it.

"What are you bringing books to bed for?" Johnny asked.

"I always carry books with me wherever I go," I said. I had Ian Hamilton's biography of Robert Lowell (out of the library) and a paperback copy of The Blithedale Romance with me.

"Get under the covers," Camilla said.

I pulled the bottom of the comforter over my legs. Camilla sat down next to me and pulled the comforter higher over both of us. She put her arms around me and kissed me on the neck. Her body felt warm and I could feel her breasts underneath her T shirt. I looked into her eyes and then passed the joint to Johnny.

"It's gorgeous outside. Let's go outside," I said. "Don't you guys want to get breakfast."

Johnny gave the joint to me, I handed it to Camilla. I smiled. "You're a force of nature."

Women won't play nature to your culture. Leaves for eyes. The empty street, bright cars. A black man stands, a white woman walks. Fallen leaves by the cement wall. To see every side of humanity at once. The sunlight leaps in the bright wind. I love to be with them because they're masters of the art of wasting time. They make going out for breakfast or just walking down Chicago streets a piquant, relaxed pleasure. I feel free and irresponsible with them but never hectic. Things become voluptuous: the way they light their cigarettes, their irony, clothes. It's not pretentious, it's not bohemian. At all. It's just an adult way of enjoying the world in a moment. It's American.

Camilla kissed me on the mouth, her lips were sweet.

that tradition

a light

handed

patriarchally

down to the sky to see

"This is a really good book," I said, holding up The Blithedale Romance. "It's about a Utopian community. It's also about the problem of self-knowledge. It's about nineteenth century romantic social theory but it's also about seventeenth century pastoral poems--and plays such as Love's Labours Lost, Twelfth Night, and As You Like It. It builds drama by discussing language, representation, rights, and nature."

"It sounds good--but I don't know what you're talking about," Johnny said.

they have to go
she said we have to go
history is male
move like fire in place in the tree trunk
move like a train
courtyard and branch also the sound of the pond beginning to thaw
the ice cracks

"You understand it, you just don't know you understand it." I tried to get him to have confidence in himself. "Maybe you aren't familiar with the 'critical vocabulary' I was just using, but that vocabulary is only a shortcut. I think you would love this book and understand it as fully as anyone."

"A lot of times, I don't understand poetry," Johnny said seriously. "I feel like I'm not educated enough. It doesn't mean anything to me. You're a poet--people must say that to you a lot."

Without realizing it, I responded using catch phrases and buzzwords. "Poetry explore's man's relationship to the earth and to the source of life. It's also an analysis of truth and language. Poetry can simply be beautiful statements, images, and sounds; it's abstract the way experimental music is abstract."

I believe what I said, but it wasn't enough. I tried to be more specific.

"It isn't a question of how much education you have," I began. "If you want to love poetry you must learn to read seriously. It isn't a sham. That means really trying to read a work, to feel it from beginning to end. Many, many people can do it. There are educated people who don't feel poetry, who don't think about it or see it or rely on it; and there are even more who simply don't like modern poetry."

"I'll look at a poem and I can see the poet is doing something, but I'm not familiar enough with poetry to know what it is," Johnny said.

"So much of what I'd like to say is said better in Meyer Schapiro's three essays on abstract painting. Everyone has a different starting point. That's why there are so many different and partly contradictory definitions of poetry. I started with Rimbaud--he still means everything to me. I also started with Baudelaire, Mallarme, Reverdy, Tzara, Klee, Kandinsky, Breton, Eluard, Desnos, Valery, and Artaud. I also started with William Carlos Williams, but then I went through a period when I couldn't read him because his language didn't seem to be beautiful, and I'm only coming out of that now. It took me longer to learn to understand Anglo-American modernists like Stein, Joyce, Yeats, Eliot, Stevens, and Pound. In College I worked

very hard on sixteenth and seventeenth century English poetry--I struggled with questions about nature and meaning through that. I also stúdied Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, German Romanticism, Wordsworth, Flaubert, and the American Renaissance. I also thought hard about Dante. I read other modern poets such as Pasternak, Mayakovsky, Rilke, Lorca, and Montale. I insist on looking at a poem from a lot of different directions at once. The first thing I concentrate on is the lauguage--the thought and movement in the images."

the wind calls to the leaves
the rain brushes the leaves
like the sigh of a spider's web
touched once by flame
and in this moment also
are the chemical shiftings of insanity
the silent gravitations of the planet

I thought I had alienated them by using too many names. I wanted to convey the urgency and humanity of experimental poetry, but it gets harder and harder for me to talk about poetry.

"Do you think anyone can understand your poetry?" Johnny asked.

I smiled, sort of laughed. "Yes. I think everyone understands it differently, but anyone can understand it. People who work in other art forms often respond to my writing very directly. A lot of painters, musicians, and filmmakers think my work is beautiful."

"Isn't a lot of that bullshit though? I believe you doubt